

WORK TEAM MEETING NOTES

March 18, 2010 Meeting

Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan Meeting

A collaborative strategy for optimizing management of the river corridor

Agenda

- Started at 9:10 am
- Purpose and Need
- Introductions
- Establish the scope
 - (Region, temporally, key elements, etc.)
- Review the Team membership of CMP
 - Work Group and Policy Team
- Identify all the appropriate stakeholders concerns
 - (That the CMP can address & resolve.)
- Review the draft objectives & goals
 - (Flood operations, flood maintenance, & the ecosystem).
- Task Order Deliverables
 - (Working with AECOM – River Partners).
- Other Studies and Data Identified
 - What data & documentation exists
 - What needs to be developed for the CMP
- Define county, city, and interest groups involvement needed
- Identify involvement from any other community groups or outreach efforts
- What are the Next steps for this Work Group?
- Identify Issues for next meeting, what is the timing for meetings and field visits
- Adjourned at 12:15 pm.

Purpose and Need

Keith Swanson –Thank you for your interest in the Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan (CMP) and for attending this meeting today. We currently are at the point where no one is truly happy with the way we manage the Lower Feather River corridor maintenance and the process for this maintenance. Many people have expressed a concern with the current State land conditions along the Lower Feather River. I feel establishing a “Common Vision” for this region is very important to all of us here today. All stakeholders have expressed a concern to me with the time and effort it takes to get anything done to maintain the corridor. The members of the Interagency Flood Management Collaborative Program Management Group have and continue to support an effort to develop a CMP for this river system. The Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) restoration efforts for this region are completed. Once we are able to get a CMP together we need to sell our ideas and processes developed in the CMP to other river groups. The individual roles of each member of this group need to be defined and we need to utilize the cooperative knowledge of the entire Work Group to benefit this effort and future efforts. We have a challenging time ahead of us. I’m sorry to leave you today so soon, but I’m excited for our future management together and the future of the Lower Feather River. At some point in the future we may need to expand our effort beyond the define Lower Feather River CMP, such as the Sutter Bypass region. But for now,

we will focus on the Lower Feather River corridor and I am ensured that you will set an example this project for how we management other rivers stretches in the future.

Introductions

Ryan Larson, Kent Zenoboa, Matt Wacker, Paul Brunner, Jennifer Hobbs, Andy Atkinson, Marti Kie, Terri Gaines, Debra Bishop, Earl Nelson, Tony Danna, Erin Brehmer, Ken Cumming, Steve Fordice, Gary Hobgood, Karen Hull (on phone), Joel Farias (on phone), Marti Kie, John Langston, Len Marino, Charles Rabamad, Jeffrey E. Twitchell, Dan Whisman (on phone), Matt Wacker, Helen Swagerty, Debra Bishop, John Carlon, Tim Williamson, Scott Rice. (see attached A)

Tony Danna – Covered an overview of today's meeting including the purpose and need, time horizons, and that this CMP effort will be similar to the Cherokee study document. The CMP will cover the lower 20 miles of the Feather River from the Sutter Bypass to the Yuba River. He showed in a PowerPoint slides four 5-mile aerial segments of the study area. He also showed PowerPoint slides of the CMP scope.

Gary Hobgood - suggested we implement coordination with the FERC relicensing of the Oroville Dam. The Oroville Floodplain is within an 8 mile area below the dam and may have biological implication that will affect this area.

Jeffrey Twitchell - is there a recreation component?

Andy Atkinson DFG – Yes, there is a major concern for recreation in the area. After 7 ½ years of planning, many public meetings, some effect flood control the DFG continues to work on this issue.

A Question among the group – Covered the purpose of the CMP and what is the authority for this planning?

Earl Nelson- DWR wants to improve public safety, improve ecosystem, and improve land uses. To achieve these goals we want to make it easier to obtain regulatory permits for maintenance while conserving and improving the ecosystem.

Paul Brunner- The ultimate authority is the adoption of the plan by CVFPB. This goes beyond just permitting. How will the flood corridor be maintained? What about funding? This plan should address funding. We also need to address hydraulics in the river. We need access to a developed model for flows in the river to give us flexibility.

John Carlon – There is an important opportunity here. This reach of the Feather River was selected because of the projects already completed in this reach. The lessons learned on how to navigate all the maintenance permits and avoid the obstacles need to be documented for future endeavors. How do all the regulatory authorities fit together, so environmental and flood benefits can coexist.

Tony Danna presented a slide on Work Group membership and asked if this is a good representation.

Jeff Twitchell – You may want to have Yuba and Sutter County land use planning people attend Work Group meetings.

Paul Brunner - I can have the Yuba county people here when they need to be. I think we should keep the group small and some of the current members can represent the other groups not listed.

Gary Hobgood – We should include agriculture representation.

Tony Danna- We need to include recreation representatives, also.

Discussion on the Purpose and Need of the Plan

Terri Gaines – The CMP should provide for a sustainable river system, while providing for the future Vision for the Lower Feather River. The question should not be the Vision versus the CMP. The vision is more than the CMP. The CMP is how we achieve the vision. We need a plan that includes only recreation that is compatible to the vision for the area.

Lower Feather River CMP - Purpose and Need – Revise the language to read: *“Develop an integrated Corridor Management Plan to implement a long-term vision for the river corridor that integrates and promotes sustainability in future management, maintenance of flood control facilities, and the restoration and enhancement of ecosystem functions and habitats.”*

Earl Nelson – Is an EIS needed? The existing projects should not be put on hold, but should keep moving as long as they are “no regrets” type projects. To the extent they are compatible with the CMP vision, they should work as a model for future projects. These current projects are acceptable as long as they contribute to the overall goals of the CMP; I don’t see a need to hold up TRLIA, Abbott and O’Connor Lake project efforts. These projects are the Pilot projects for the CMP.

Group Discussion - The TRLIA Setback was done in 18 months; this CMP effort should not have too long of a timeframe, but 18 months should be a realistic goal to finish planning, adopt the plan, and secure programmatic maintenance permits. Review of third parties’ plans and existing compatible plans need to be added to the list as a goal. There is the RAMP program that encompasses this area that is being worked on right now. The authority we have to do our business is not as important as achieving the goals of the collaborative group.

Ryan Larson ACE – The CMP should lay out the state and federal agency considerations and to define the process to improve ecosystem management.

Paul Brunner – establish the steps that will get us to our vision. Compatible and sustainable needs should be defined within the CMP. The CMP needs to be a flexible plan that moves us in the right direction perhaps using various methods to achieve our goals and objectives. Use Adaptive Management Policies to meet the goals and the vision we establish.

Group discussion - Using the programmatic permitting is implied in our purpose and need, but it could be fleshed out more.

John Carlon – The CMP should contribute to the studies and work that has already been done. It is not as if we are changing only for change sake.

Discussion on Work Group Member Issues and Concerns:

Gary Hobgood, North Region Department of Fish & Game –

1. DFG has multiple hats: we are land and recreation managers, we protect wildlife and endangered species, and we ensure CEQA is done thoroughly.
2. Regulatory authority over CESA, state listed species must be addressed. CEQA is important to DFG.
3. We need to address cumulative effects of this project over the long term.
4. Streambed Alterations – we need to work together toward a collaborative effort to provide beneficial spin offs.
5. We need projects to get things accomplished on the ground to make a difference
6. The Goal is to streamline permitting in the same way we did for the emergency levee repairs and the small erosion repair efforts.
7. DFG's primary goal is to have flood plain habitat enhancement for diverse wildlife species. We would like to see net gains for the environment by establishing more riparian and floodplain habitats to provide more benefits for diverse wildlife species.
8. We need to recognize recreational uses in region.
9. The work group is a subgroup of the Collaborative process.
10. We should not separate these projects as either flood control or river flow issues. We can make progress if we work together towards issue resolution on both flood control and river flow.

Andy Atkinson, DFG –

1. I desire a process that comes out of the CMP that will stop looking at flood control and habitat enhancement as incompatible.
2. The riparian bio system is both terrestrial and aquatic. The lower Feather River riparian habitat has been obliterated over the last 50 years.
3. The CMP should be an efficient and money saving document over the long run.
4. Sediment removal could be a possible money saver in future if planned wisely.
5. Look at saving the riparian ecosystem through wise planning.
6. There are unique habitats found in many areas along the study area.
7. Our job will be made easier if we keep a positive perspective while looking at flood control and habitat management as compatible.

Tim Williamson - DFG –

1. Make sure we look at what has been done historically on the river, to make sure this effort fits into what has already been done, without causing incompatibility and future adverse effects. "Let's not reinvent the wheel."

Jeffrey E. Twitchell - Levee District 1, Yuba City Basin –

1. Expressed concern to CVFPB for the availability of long term funding to maintain the flood safety attributes of the system, so vegetation can be controlled if necessary.
2. LD-1 would like to use new setback conveyance capacity as the baseline rather than historic conditions.

3. I would like to see a safe harbor conditions similar to O'Connor Lakes so vegetation can be removed. Enhancement Safe Harbor provisions should be included in the CMP.
4. Locate new areas for public access, like trailheads, so maintaining agencies can control where recreation occurs.
5. An early assignment is to develop a land ownership map. What is already owned by state, other private lands? Map all of the current land uses. What sites are good candidates for restoration?
6. We need a mechanism to ensure flood conveyance is given a priority. Lower the flood stage while doing habitat restoration.

Steve Fordice River District 784 –

1. My main interest is public safety and the reduction of vandalism, individuals have found destroyed gates.
2. We need a more holistic approach to managing the region.
3. We need to include agriculture for habitat and economic benefit.
4. We need to have economic and social impacts fleshed out prior to any decisions.
5. Establish a Safe Harbor mitigation effort for the region, rather than establishing multiple small areas one at a time. No one wants to go to jail for not doing required maintenance.
6. We need to continue open dialogue among all parties.

Paul Brunner - Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority

1. The key issue is: Do the maintaining agencies have adequate funding to do the required long term vegetation and levee structure maintenance work?
2. There is concern about regulatory agencies actually doing the floodway management and getting the permits needed in a timely manner.
3. He would like to see programmatic permits issued for long term maintenance.
4. We need to establish standard maintenance procedures and accomplish the required routine maintenance.
5. The CMP should avoid controversial and establish a process to accomplish the routine work.
6. We need to establish the project design and planning guidelines to give ultimate flexibility to future management.
7. When doing hydrological modeling, use the higher roughness parameters in model calculations to increase the safety factor.
8. We want to see recreation that is compatible with the environment. Recreation opportunities on the Feather River are being lost due to lack of cooperative planning between local communities and multiple state and federal agencies. A single focus and a cooperative development process is needed similar to what was accomplished along the American River Parkway.
9. We are waiting for leadership and a plan from the State land holders. Opportunities are being lost while we wait for this CMP.
10. TRLIA tried to be conservative in the hydro modeling when we created the 6 mile setback levee.
11. People want to fish but due to access restrictions in the area they become frustrated. This frustration leads to them then ripping out gates to gain access. How can we allow access and prevent vandalism? These acts of vandalism are creating a hardship on private land owners while solutions are being planned and developed. We need ideas to prevent and resolve vandalism, while maintaining private property rights. This 18 month planning timeframe is too long to wait.

Jennifer Hobbs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1. We need a CMP to allow for restoration while allowing for listed species recovery, without compromising flood conveyance. My primary concern is listed species recovery.
2. I want to spell out permit conditions and the allowed activities ahead of time to make regulations work more efficient.
3. We need to allow vegetation restoration to occur while flood protection is still maintained.
4. I feel that a look at programmatic permitting is a good thing for all regulatory agencies.
5. The CMP needs to address public safety and reduce facilities vandalism by taking a holistic approach to mitigation.
6. The CMP should address agricultural uses and issues.
7. The CMP must discuss riparian habitat restoration, while being concerned for the economic and social impacts.
8. The CMP should address funding for mitigation so that it is a onetime operation and solution.
9. We need to continue to talk together so we are in sync and stop being put at odds.

Ken Cumming, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration –

1. We need to optimize riparian habitat.
2. We must understand fish habitat (life cycle) provisions and plan accordingly.
3. We need to be more sensitive to flow regimes for temperature, water quality, and bio stimuli.
4. We need permit simplification.
5. We need constructive response from permittees to terms and conditions from regulators.
6. We need habitat stressor reduction (water quality, invasive species - stripe bass reduction).

Ryan Larson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

1. Ensure the integrity of Federal flood control system.
2. The CMP should find ways to encourage ecosystem restoration within the Feather River system and not have an adverse impact on the flood protection.

Debra Bishop, AECOM

1. Our meetings should have clear objectives to meet deadlines.
2. We need to define the role of the policy group.
3. We need to coordinate early and integrate with the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).
4. This effort should be a part of CVFPP.
5. Meeting efficiencies should be measurable.
6. The Policy group has bigger role but is not the people that are here.
7. The Working Group should be doing the work.
8. We need more coordination with CVFPP and incorporated our findings and efforts together with them.
9. We need to combine our funding efforts with the CVFPP and tie those funds together.
10. We need to keep Big Picture ideas in mind while doing our efforts on the ground.

John Carlon River Partners –

1. My concerns are that we are able to compile good science and good information to make the best decisions with all interests addressed in an open and transparent process.
2. I don't want us to get stalemated from moving forward to achieve mutual benefits.

Charles Rabamad –

1. I am concerned about the long term funding for restoration and maintenance.
2. We need to incorporate into ongoing design work for wave action analysis. Current ongoing design work on wave vegetation buffering needs to keep moving forward.
3. We need more Policy people from the public sector on the CMP.
4. I see only public agencies here today; no private entities are at the table.

Goals Discussion:

Added to the Goals – Geomorphic sediment.

Ryan Larson – I am concerned with Goal #2. What is meaning on the last part. “Optimize” is this a word that DWR uses. The action word “direct” and the Agencies meaning or use of this work is not fully understood. Modeling by MBK, they have the background to do the work from their history.

John Carlon – CBFed “Wood Rogers” may have pre-contract requirements. There is 2D modeling HH study for CVFPP. AECOM can contract with other organizations, but they can also do the work in house

Paul Brunner – What is “Best”? “Is it the easiest contracting process versus who does the best work? It is, of course, DWR’s call on who does this. MBK has done a lot of work with TRLIA.

Jeff Twitchell - ask Len Moreno who should do the modeling. Can the contracting of the T.O. include the Bypass?

John Carlon – the limiting of the contracting to hit the 18 mo deadline. What group has contracting authority? The creditability of the work product will be based on the modeling contractor that the group chooses to do the modeling. This will determine if stakeholders buy into the contractors’ work product.

Andy Atkinson – Let’s do it right the first time

Jeff Twitchell- The 2D is sufficient. The modeling should be available to the entire group on the team. It should be a model that all agree to – public domain. There is concern with the timing of getting the document done. For higher data reliability more data is required. The use of LiDAR data could be concern if this data is not available timely. Six months or June 2010 the data will be done.

“We will discuss the modeling issue at a later date.”

Ryan Larson – The CMP should work within the existing channel design. When determining if there is an impact on the Federal Flood Control Project, the Corps of Engineers will be using the Congressionally authorized design flow. The CMP will not be proposing any new design flows or going to Congress to change the authorized flow.

Objectives: Mitigation discussion – HCP efforts, there are none yet begun in the area, just some under consideration. Look to see if any HCP and State NCCP have been done in the region. These plans are not in sync and may deal with different issues and levels of stakeholder involvement. An ESA or NEPA process may be needed for the CMP. What types of legal challenges are foreseen?

T.O. Deliverables Discussion

1. Hydraulic modeling needs to be an element included in the CMP.
2. We need to wait until we have more data available to make a decision on what is in the contract.
3. John Carlon – There is too much self interest listed on what needs to be a deliverable. What do we want to see as actions or tangible products out of this plan?
4. Marti Kie – Do we need to consider phasing in the contracting?
5. Gary Hobgood – The round table needs to have input into what they want on the list.
6. Paul Brunner – We need to have more products from this effort than just a document. I recommend an approach to accomplish more hard products, such as a long term funding process. We need more thinking by the consultants to recommend solutions to the issues. A baseline biological survey was done for TRLIA that could be incorporated into this bigger project. The deliverables should include how do we accomplish and maintain the vision we have developed for the Lower Feather River. This is the bigger question. What is the existing ecosystem, how do we achieve the future vision, how do we maintain that future vision and then how do we share the future vision? The Bear River work can help the Feather River projects. An entirely new thought process is needed.
7. Andy Atkinson – we need to include all existing agreements and all constraints that impact our opportunities to achieve something in this document to define where we are at now. The DFG / DWR draft MOU references to former MOU agreements would be a good place to start
8. Earl Nelson – To get items out to all the work group team members we could put items into a website, that will include all past data and all MOU's, agreements, relicensing (project 2100), and other items currently available.
9. John Carlon – We need to define "Funding" and get agreement on what this term means to the team.

Suggested we meet every month.

Next Meeting April 15 Thursday 9 AM

Attachement B

**Thursday March 18, 2010
Work Group Meeting
JOC DWR LL-20**

ATTENDANCE SHEET

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone #
	Keith Swanson	Flood Management Office DWR	916-574-1302
Work Group Members			
	Earl Nelson	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-1244
	Tony Danna	FMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-0383
	Paul Brunner	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	530-749-5679
	Erin Brehmer	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2236
	Ken Cumming	National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin.	916-930-3656
	Steve Fordice	River District 784	530-742-0520
	Terri Gaines	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-653-6520
	Gary Hobgood	Department of Fish & Game	916-983-6920
Phone	Karen Hull	Sutter Yard, Department of Water Resources	530-370-5769
	Marti Kie	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-0381
	John Langston	FPEIP Department of Water Resources	916-574-2880
	Ryan Larson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	916-557-7568
	Len Marino	Central Valley Flood Protection Board	916-574-0608
	Charles Rabamad	Department of Water Resources	916-574-2982
	Jeffrey E. Twitchell	Levee District 1	916-631-4555
	Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	916-414-6541
Phone	Dan Whisman	LRFMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-1403
	Matt Wacker	AECOM	916-266-4907
	Helen Swagerty	River Partners	530-894-5401 x227
	Debra Bishop	AECOM	916-414-5850
	John Carlon	River Partners	530-894-5401 x224
	Tim Williamson	DFG – North Central Region	530-538-2236
	Andy Atkinson	DFG – North Central Region	530-846-5064
	Scott Rice	DWR	916-837-6415
	Kent Zenobia	DWR	916-574-2639
Phone	Joel Farias	Sutter Yard, Department of Water Resources	530-370-5769

Attachement C

Other Comments:

Chun, Stephanie – “The contact for Feather River fisheries issues is **Ryon Kurth** from DWR (rkurth@water.ca.gov). He’s a good biologist; he’s worked on the Feather River for ~10 years and has a lot of experience and expertise in the area. Feel free to contact him as you get further into your project!”

Gaines, Terri – “Develop an integrated Corridor Management Plan to implement a long-term vision for the river corridor that integrates and promotes sustainability in future management, maintenance of flood control facilities, and the restoration and enhancement of ecosystem functions and habitats.”

Marino, Len –

- Please add Andrea Mauro, our new Environmental Scientist, to your roster. She will be your primary CVFPB rep. I will remain as back-up, and want to receive all your emails.
- You can remove Nancy Moricz off your list.
- I had a nice chat with Casandra Enos who now represents the Oroville FERC relicense settlement team. She would like to be on your email roster and will attend the next meeting. Previous e-mail - Regarding the Lower Feather River CMP coordination FERC Settlement Agreement; “I believe we should be coordinating with your relicensing work group that has a similar mission below Oroville Dam out to the FERC boundary and it may be beneficial to have a representative knowledgeable of Feather River PM&E’s participate in our program. Please send us the name of the right person?”

Kenneth Cumming – “A thought that occurred to me as I wrote up my notes from Tuesday's CMP meeting - One important part of the recent CVFPP meetings success was the setting up at the outset of those meetings of a code of behavior that the members voluntarily ascribed to. Signing a code became a strong impetus to civil reasoning and respect for one another when different points of view came into discussion. I recommend that you consider something like that to keep the deliberations friendly and productive.” Ken

Attachement D Handout

**TASK ORDER NUMBER # XX
Division of Flood Management
Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan
CONTRACT NUMBER 4600008120
DATE: March 17, 2010**

1. A regional project location map.
2. A project base map.
3. Restoration Opportunity Maps in five (5) mile segments of the Lower Feather River printed on a large enough scale to allow for work groups drawing vision of future management and maintenance on base maps.
4. Identify all potential environmental permits needed for the maintenance work along the length of the lower Feather River (including adjacent areas) and what each of the permits covers. Assure that all permits and the plan are in compliance with all pertinent laws and executive orders. (Examples include: National Environmental Policy Act; California Environmental Quality Act; Federal Endangered Species Act; California Endangered Species Act; California Department of Fish and Game 1600 series; Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 and Associated Regulations; Clean Water Act Section 401, 402, and 404; Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act; the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (for excavation and deposition of fill material); Central Valley Flood Protection Board Encroachment guidelines; National Historic Preservation Act; and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.)
5. Describe application process for each permit; how to apply for those permits; and what supportive information is required, and whether permit can be programmatic or a Memorandum of Understanding.
6. Define the steps necessary for programmatic compliance, so a new permit is not needed each time a new (but similar) maintenance activity is undertaken.
7. Assist in actually securing those applicable permits needed for all foreseeable maintenance work.
8. Develop a Habitat Conservation Plan under Section 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act if needed for Lower Feather River CMP Project area.
9. Draft a Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan.